arXiv:1603.01473v4 [math.AP] 14 Mar 2016

Exact and optimal controllability for scalar conservation laws with discontinuous flux

Adimurthi* Shyam Sundar Ghoshal† Pierangelo Marcati‡

March 16, 2016

Abstract

This paper deals with an optimal control problem and describes the reachable set for the scalar 1-D conservation laws with discontinuous flux. Regarding the optimal control problem we first prove the existence of a minimizer and then we prescribe an algorithm to compute it. The same method also applies to compute the initial data control. The proof relies on the explicit formula for the conservation laws with the discontinuous flux and finer properties of the characteristics.

Key words: Scalar conservation laws, discontinuous flux, exact control, optimal control, Hamilton-Jacobi equation.

1 Introduction

The goal of this paper is to study the optimal and exact control problem of the following scalar conservation laws with discontinuous flux

$$\begin{cases} u_t + F(x,u)_x = 0, \\ \qquad u(x,0) = u_0(x), \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

where the flux F is given by, $F(x,u) = H(x)f(u) + (1-H(x))g(u)$, H is the Heaviside function. Through out the present article we assume the fluxes f, g to be $C^1(\mathbb{R})$, strictly convex with superlinear growth; $u_0 \in L^\infty$. We denote by θ_f, θ_g the unique minima of the fluxes f, g respectively.

*Centre for Applicable Mathematics, Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Post Bag No 6503, Sharadanagar, Bangalore - 560065, India. Email: aditi@math.tifrbng.res.in.

†Gran Sasso Science Institute, Viale Francesco Crispi, 7, 67100 L'Aquila, Italy. Email: shyam.ghoshal@gssi.infn.it.

‡Gran Sasso Science Institute, Viale Francesco Crispi, 7, 67100 L'Aquila, Italy and Department of Information Engineering, Computer Science and Mathematics, University of L'Aquila, 67100 L'Aquila, Italy. Email: pierangelo.marcati@gssi.infn.it/pierangelo.marcati@univaq.it.

There is no literature concerning reachable set or any sort of optimal controllability results for equations of type (1). In the present paper we obtain a necessary and sufficient condition for the reachable set and we prove the existence of a minimizer for an optimal control problem. In order to obtain an initial data control or finding minimizer of optimal control, we use a new backward resolution. The advantage of this approach is that it is constructive and easy to compute. The main difficulty of this backward resolution is that there are no rarefactions originating from the interface $x = 0$, then one cannot just generalize, to the case $f \neq g$, the backward construction given in [1, 2] for the case in $f = g$.

In order to state our main results, we need to introduce various notations and technical arguments hence the main Theorems 4.1 and 5.1 have been postponed to the sections 4 and 5 respectively.

The scalar conservation laws with discontinuous flux of type (1) has a huge variety of applications in several fields, namely traffic flow modeling, modeling gravity, modeling continuous sedimentation in clarifier-thickener units, ion etching in the semiconductor industry and many more.

In the past two decades the first order model of type (1) has been extensively studied from both the theoretical and numerical point of view. Concerning the uniqueness it is worth to mention that the following Kružkov type entropy inequalities in both the two upper quarter-planes are not sufficient to guarantee the uniqueness,

$$\begin{array}{ll} \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \left(\phi_1(u)\frac{\partial s}{\partial t} + \psi_1(u)\frac{\partial s}{\partial x}\right) & \geq -\int_0^\infty \psi_1(u(0+,t))s(0,t)dt, \\ \int_{-\infty}^0 \int_0^\infty \left(\phi_2(u)\frac{\partial s}{\partial t} + \psi_2(u)\frac{\partial s}{\partial x}\right) & \geq \int_0^\infty \psi_2(u(0+,t))s(0,t)dt. \end{array} \tag{2}$$

Here (ϕ_i, ψ_i) denote the entropy pairs for $i = 1, 2$ and $s \in C_0^1(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+)$, a non-negative test function. Consequently one need an extra criteria on the interface called "interface entropy condition" (see [4]) given by

$$\text{meas}\{t : f'(u(0+,t)) > 0, g'(u(0-,t)) < 0\} = 0. \tag{3}$$

Using this extra entropy along with the above Kružkov type inequalities the uniqueness result has been obtained in [4]. On the other hand, the existence result has been proved in several ways, namely via Hamilton-Jacobi, convergence of numerical schemes, vanishing viscosity method, for further details we refer the reader to [4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 13, 14, 20, 21, 25] and the references therein. The present paper uses the explicit formula obtained in [4, 7], via the Hamilton-Jacobi Cauchy problem. By using this formula it can be shown that if v_0 is uniformly Lipschitz then $v(\cdot, t)$ is also uniformly Lipschitz for all $t > 0$ and if we denote $u := \frac{\partial v}{\partial x}$, it follows easily that u is the unique weak solution (see [4]) satisfying (2), enjoys (3) near interface and satisfies

the following Rankine-Hugoniot condition on the interface.

$$\text{meas}\big\{t : f(u(0+,t)) \neq g(u(0-,t))\big\} = 0. \tag{4}$$

Regarding the well-posedness theory to $f = g$ case, we refer the reader to [19] for Cauchy problem and for the initial boundary value problem to [24].

Through out this paper we work with the solution which is obtained from the Hamilton-Jacobi formulation.

Concerning the exact controllability for the scalar convex conservation laws the first work has been done in [10], where they considered the initial boundary value problem in a quarter plane with $u_0 = 0$ and by using one boundary control they investigated the reachable set. As in [1], they considered $u_0 \in L^\infty$ and three possible cases, namely pure initial value problem with initial data control outside any domain, initial boundary value problem in a quarter plane with one boundary control and initial boundary problem in a strip with two boundary controls to get the reachable sets in a complete generality. In both the articles the Lax-Oleinik type formulas has been exploited. An alternative approach has been provided in [23] by using the return method (see [17]). For the viscous Burgers equation any non-zero state can be reached in finite time by two boundary controls [22]. A general theory for the system of conservation laws is still largely unavailable, nevertheless in [12], the authors constructed an example showing that exact controllability to a constant cannot be reached in a finite time and proved asymptotic stabilization to a constant by two boundary controls. Recently, under dissipative boundary conditions the asymptotic stabilization to 0 has been proved in [18] for 2×2 system, when the velocities are positive. For the Temple class systems and triangular type systems we refer the reader to [11] and [8] respectively.

Let us briefly discuss the optimal controllability results for the case $f = g$. Assume the target function $k \in L^2_{loc}$, $T > 0$, we denote by $J_{\{f=g\}}$, a cost functional, defined in the following way

$$J_{\{f=g\}}(u_0) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |f'(u(x,T)) - f'(k(x))|^2 dx, \tag{5}$$

where $u_0 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, $u_0 \equiv \theta_f$ outside a compact set, θ_f being the only critical point of the flux f. Here $u(\cdot, T)$ denotes the unique weak solution at $t = T$ to the Cauchy problem (1), in the case $f = g$ with initial datum u_0. Then in this case, the optimal control reads like : find a w_0 such that $J_{\{f=g\}}(w_0) = \min_{u_0} J_{\{f=g\}}(u_0)$. In [15, 16], they considered the above optimal control problem for the Burgers' equation and proved such minimizer exists and proposed a numerical scheme called "alternating decent algorithm", although the convergence of these scheme still remains open. Whereas in [2], they made use of the Lax-Oleinik formula and derived a numerical backward construction which converges to a solution of the above problem. The latter

method can be applied also to general convex fluxes as long as a Lax-Oleinik type formula is available. It has to be noticed that even for the case $f = g$, due to the occurrence of the shocks in the solution of (1), one may have several minimizers of the optimal control problem (5).

We organize the paper in the following manner, section 2 deals with the existing results collected from [4, 7]. Section 3 consists of some important Lemmas and the backward construction. Then we state and prove the result concerning optimal controllability in section 4. Finally in section 5, we state and prove the exact controllability result.

2 Known facts about discontinuous fluxes

In order to make the paper self contained we recall some results, definitions and notations from [4].

DEFINITION 2.1. ***Control curve*** *: Let $0 < t$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\gamma \in C([0,t],\mathbb{R})$. Then γ is said to be a control curve if the following holds: it is piecewise affine on $[0,t]$ with at most 3 segments, each segment must be completely inside a closed quarter plane. If they are exactly 3, then the middle one is on the line $x = 0$ and the other two must be either in the positive or negative quarter plane. Moreover, no segment can cross $x = 0$. Let $c(x,t)$ be the set of control curves, $c_0(x,t)$ is the subset of $c(x,t)$ consists of only one segment. $c_r(x,t)$ is the subset containing exactly 3 segments and $c_b(x,t) = c(x,t) \setminus \{c_0(x,t) \cup c_r(x,t)\}$.*

DEFINITION 2.2. ***Cost function****: Let f^*, g^* be the convex duals of the fluxes. Let us assume that $v_0 : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be an uniformly Lipschitz continuous function. Let $(x,t) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+$, $\gamma \in c(x,t)$. The cost functional Γ associated to v_0 is defined by*

$$\Gamma_{v_0,\gamma}(x,t) = v_0(\gamma(0)) + \int\limits_{\{\theta\in[0,t]\ :\ \gamma(\theta)>0\}} f^*(\dot\gamma)d\theta + \int\limits_{\{\theta\in[0,t]\ :\ \gamma(\theta)<0\}} g^*(\dot\gamma)d\theta$$
$$+meas\{\theta \in [0,t]\ :\ \gamma(\theta) = 0\} min\{f^*(0), g^*(0)\}.$$

Then we define the value function $v : \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}$ by $v(x,t) = \inf\limits_{\gamma\in c(x,t)} \{\Gamma_{\gamma,v_0}(x,t)\}$.

DEFINITION 2.3. *Let us define by $ch(x,t) = \{\gamma\ :\ \Gamma_{v_0,\gamma}(x,t) = v(x,t)\}$, the set of* ***characteristics curves****. Let $t > 0$, define*

$$\begin{aligned}
R_1(t) &= \inf\{x\ ;\ x \geq 0,\ ch(x,t) \subset c_0(x,t)\},\\
R_2(t) &= \begin{cases} \inf\{x\ ;\ 0 \leq x \leq R_1(t),\ ch(x,t) \cap c_r(x,t) \neq \phi\},\\ R_1(t) \quad \textit{if the above set is empty.}\end{cases}\\
L_1(t) &= \sup\{x\ ;\ x \leq 0,\ ch(x,t) \subset c_0(x,t)\},\\
L_2(t) &= \begin{cases} \sup\{x\ ;\ L_1(t) \leq x \leq 0,\ ch(x,t) \cap c_r(x,t) \neq \phi\},\\ L_1(t) \quad \textit{if the above set is empty.}\end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

For $f = g$ case, a detailed study of the above curves has been done in [1, 3].

THEOREM 2.1. *(See [4]) Let $u_0 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ and $v_0(x) := \int_0^x u_0(\theta)d\theta$. Then*

1. *Then the function v is uniformly Lipschitz continuous and $u := \frac{\partial v}{\partial x}$ solves (1) in weak sense with initial data u_0.*

2. *u satisfies Rankine-Hugoniot condition (4) and interface entropy condition (3) near the interface.*

3. *$R_1(\cdot), L_1(\cdot)$ are Lipschitz continuous functions and there exists a function $y : \{(-\infty, L_1(t)] \cup [R_1(t), \infty)\} \times (0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ such that for all $t > 0$, $x \mapsto y(\cdot, t)$ is non decreasing function.*

4. *There exist non increasing function $t_+ : [0, R_1(t)] \to [0, t]$ and a non decreasing function $t_- : [L_1(t), 0] \to [0, t]$ such the Explicit formula is given by*

$$f'(u(x,t)) = \left(\tfrac{x-y(x,t)}{t}\right)\mathbf{1}_{x\geq R_1(t)} + \left(\tfrac{x}{t-t_+(x,t)}\right)\mathbf{1}_{0\leq x<R_1(t)}. \quad (6)$$

$$g'(u(x,t)) = \left(\tfrac{x-y(x,t)}{t}\right)\mathbf{1}_{x\leq L_1(t)} + \left(\tfrac{x}{t-t_-(x,t)}\right)\mathbf{1}_{L_1(t)<x<0}. \quad (7)$$

5. *Let $V_+ = \{t : R_1(t) > 0\}, V_- = \{t : L_1(t) < 0\}$. Then there exist non increasing function $y_{-,0} : V_+ \to (-\infty, 0]$ and a non decreasing function $y_{+,0} : V_- \to [0, \infty)$ such that $g'(u(0-,t)) = -\frac{y_{-,0}(t)}{t}$, for $t \in V_+ \setminus D_+$, $f'(u(0+,t)) = -\frac{y_{+,0}(t)}{t}$, for $t \in V_- \setminus D_-$ and $f(u(0+,t)) = g(u(0-,t))$, for $t \in (V_+ \setminus D_+) \cup (V_- \setminus D_-)$, where $D_\pm$ are the points of discontinuities of $y_{\pm,0}$.*

6. *For each $T > 0$, one of the following holds,*

   i). If $R_1(T) > 0, L_1(T) = 0$, then $\forall\ t \in (t_+(R_1(T)-, T), T), R_1(t) > 0$,
   where $t_+(R_1(T)-, T) = \lim_{x\to R_1(T)-} t_+(x, T)$, (see figure 2, case i).

   ii). If $R_1(T) = 0, L_1(T) < 0$, then $\forall\ t \in (t_-(L_1(T)+, T), T), L_1(t) < 0$,
   where $t_-(L_1(T)+, T) = \lim_{x\to L_1(T)+} t_-(x, T)$.

   iii). $R_1(T) = 0 = L_1(T)$, (see figure 2, case iii).



Figure 1: Case i : when $R_1(T) > 0, L_1(T) = 0$, Case iii : when $R_1(T) = 0, L_1(T) = 0$.

3 Key technical lemmas

Let us denote $f_+ = f\mid_{[\theta_f,\infty)}, f_- = f\mid_{(-\infty,\theta_f]}, g_+ = g\mid_{[\theta_g,\infty)}, g_- = g\mid_{(-\infty,\theta_f]}$, where θ_f, θ_g be the unique minimums of the fluxes f, g respectively. Let $\bar{\theta}_f, \bar{\theta}_g$ such that

$$\begin{cases} f'(\bar{\theta}_g) \geq 0, f(\bar{\theta}_g) = g(\theta_g) & \text{if} \quad g(\theta_g) \geq f(\theta_f), \\ g'(\bar{\theta}_f) \leq 0, f(\theta_f) = g(\bar{\theta}_f) & \text{if} \quad g(\theta_g) \leq f(\theta_f). \end{cases}$$

Let

$$I_+ = \begin{cases} [\bar{\theta}_g, \infty) & \text{if} \quad g(\theta_g) \geq f(\theta_f), \\ [\theta_f, \infty) & \text{if} \quad g(\theta_g) \leq f(\theta_f). \end{cases}$$

Define $h_+ : I_+ \to [0,\infty)$ by $h_+(p) = g' \circ g_+^{-1} \circ f \circ f'^{-1}(p)$. Then clearly h_+ is well defined and strictly increasing function. Let

$$I_- = \begin{cases} [\theta_g, \infty) & \text{if} \quad g(\theta_g) \geq f(\theta_f) \\ [\bar{\theta}_f, \infty) & \text{if} \quad g(\theta_g) \leq f(\theta_f). \end{cases}$$

Similarly we define a strictly decreasing function $h_- : I_- \to (-\infty, 0]$ by $h_-(p) = f' \circ f_-^{-1} \circ g \circ g'^{-1}(p)$.

3.1 No rarefaction waves on the interface

The following Lemma plays a key role in our result since excludes that forward rarefaction waves emanates from the interface.

LEMMA 3.1. *$x \mapsto t_+(x,t)$ is a strictly decreasing function in $(0, R_1(t))$ and $x \mapsto t_-(x,t)$ is a strictly increasing function in $(L_1(t), 0)$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality we assume that for some $T > 0$, $R_1(T) > 0$ and $L_1(T) = 0$. Define $X_T : [t_+(R_1(T)-, T), T] \to [0, R_1(T)]$ by $X_T(t) = \text{Max}\{x \ : \ t_+(x, T) \geq t\}$. Since $x \mapsto t_+(x, T)$ is a non increasing function, hence $t \mapsto X_T(t)$ is a non increasing function. Since the limits of characteristics curves are characteristics curves, hence there exists a $\gamma \in (c_r(X_T(t), T) \cup c_b(X_T(t), T)) \cap ch(X_T(t), T)$ such that $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3)$, where the first component of γ is given by $\gamma_1(\theta) = X_T(t) + (\theta - T)\frac{X_T(t)}{T - t_+(X_T(t)-, t)}$, for $\theta \in [t_+(X_T(t)-, T), T]$. Let D_1 = set of discontinuities of the mapping $t \mapsto X_T(t)$. Then D_1 is countable and as in Step 1, Lemma 4.10 of [4], it can be shown that for all $t \notin D_1$. The R-H condition holds, i.e,. $f(u(0+, t)) = g(u(0-, t))$ for all $t \notin D_1$. Now we state the following claim which will conclude the Lemma.

Claim 1: $t \mapsto X_T(t)$ is a continuous function.

Suppose not, then there exists $t_0 \in [0, T]$ such that

$$x_0 = X_T(t_0+) < X_T(t_0-) = x_1. \tag{8}$$

Due to the fact that characteristics do not intersect properly, we have for all $x \in (x_0, x_1)$, $t_+(x, T) = t_0$. Observe that the straight line $\alpha(t) := (t - t_0)\left(\frac{x_1}{T - t_0}\right)$ is a characteristic curve. Since characteristics do not intersect properly, we conclude $R_1(t) > 0$, for all $t \in (t_0, T]$, hence by entropy condition (3), we have $L_1(t) = 0$ for all $t \in (t_0, T]$.

Claim 2: There exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that for all $t \in [t_0 - \epsilon, t_0]$, $R_1(t) > 0$.

If not, then there exists a sequence $\{t_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ with $t_{k+1} > t_k$ such that $R_1(t_k) = 0$ and $\lim_{k\to\infty} t_k = t_0$. Since $R_1(t_k) = 0$, therefore there exists a sequence $\{y_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ with $y_k \geq 0$ such that $\beta_k(t) := (t - t_k)(-\frac{y_k}{t_k})$ is a characteristic curve. The function $t \mapsto y_{+,0}(t)$ is non decreasing hence we conclude $y_{k+1} \geq y_k$, for all k. Then $\{y_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ is a non decreasing sequence and bounded below by 0, therefore converges to some $y_0 \geq 0$ (say). By the definition of characteristics curve we conclude

$$v(0, t_k) = v_0(y_k) + t_k f^*\left(-\frac{y_k}{t_k}\right). \tag{9}$$

Since v is uniformly Lipschitz and y_k, t_k converges to y_0, t_0 respectively, we pass to the limit in the equation (9) to obtain $v(0, t_0) = v_0(y_0) + t_0 f^*\left(-\frac{y_0}{t_0}\right)$. Which proves that the straight line $\beta(t) := (t - t_0)(-\frac{y_0}{t_0})$, is a characteristic curve. Define the straight line $\gamma(t) := x_1 + (t - T)\left(\frac{\alpha(T) - \beta(0)}{T}\right)$. By using the fact that α, β are characteristics curves and f^* is a strict convex function, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} v(\alpha(T), T) &\leq v_0(\gamma(0)) + T f^*\left(\tfrac{\alpha(T) - \beta(0)}{T}\right) = v_0(\beta(0)) + T f^*\left(\tfrac{\alpha(T) - \beta(0)}{T}\right) \\ &< v_0(\beta(0)) + t_0 f^*(\dot{\beta}) + (T - t_0) f^*(\dot{\alpha}) = v(0, t_0) + (T - t_0) f^*(\dot{\alpha}) \\ &= v(\alpha(T), T), \end{aligned}$$



Figure 2: An illustration of the Lemma 3.1

which is a contradiction. Hence the claim 2. Therefore by entropy condition (3) and claim 2, we obtain

$$\text{for all } t \in [t_0-\epsilon, T], L_1(t) = 0 \text{ and } R_1(t) > 0. \tag{10}$$

Due to R-H condition, (8) and (10), we can consider the sequences $\{x_{0,k}\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$, $\{x_{1,k}\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$, $\{t_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$, $\{\bar{t}_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ with $\lim_{k\to\infty} x_{0,k} = x_0$, $\lim_{k\to\infty} x_{1,k} = 0$, $\lim_{k\to\infty} t_k = t_0$, $\lim_{k\to\infty} \bar{t}_k = t_0$ such that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $x_{0,k+1} \geq x_{0,k}, x_{1,k+1} < x_{1,k}$, $t_{k+1} \leq t_k, \bar{t}_{k+1} > \bar{t}_k$, $f(u(0+,t_k)) = g(u(0-,t_k))$, $f(u(0+,\bar{t}_k)) = g(u(0-,\bar{t}_k))$, $\eta_k(t) := (t-t_k)\left(\frac{x_{0,k}}{T-t_k}\right)$ and $\bar{\eta}_k(t) := (t-\bar{t}_k)\left(\frac{x_{1,k}}{t_0-t_k}\right)$ are characteristics curves. Note that the slopes characteristics curves η_k and $\bar{\eta}_k$ converges to the slopes characteristics curves $\eta(t) := (t-t_0)\left(\frac{x_0}{T-t_0}\right)$ and $\bar{\eta}(t) := (t-t_0)\left(\frac{x_1}{T-t_0}\right)$ respectively, which proves

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} u(0+,t_k) = u(0+,t_0+)(\text{say}) \text{ and } \lim_{k\to\infty} u(0+,\bar{t}_k) = u(0+,t_0-)(\text{say}). \tag{11}$$

On the other hand, $\eta(t)$ and $\bar{\eta}(t)$ are characteristics curves, hence $u(0+,t_0+) = (f')^{-1}(\frac{x_0}{T-t_0})$ and $u(0+,t_0-) = (f')^{-1}(\frac{x_1}{T-t_0})$. Since $x_0 < x_1$, clearly

$$u(0+,t_0+) < u(0+,t_0-). \tag{12}$$

Therefore from (11) and (12), there exists a $\delta_1 > 0$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $k > m$,

$$u(0+,\bar{t}_k) - u(0+,t_k) > \delta_1. \tag{13}$$

Again by R-H condition (4) and (13), there exists a $\delta_2 > 0$ such that for all $k > m$,

$$g'(u(0+,\bar{t}_k)) - g'(u(0+,t_k)) > \delta_2. \tag{14}$$

Due to the fact that $L_1(t) = 0$ in the neighborhood of t_0, by using explicit formulas there exists sequences $\{y_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}, \{\bar{y}_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ such that $g'(u(0-, t_k)) = -\frac{y_k}{t_k}$ and $g'(u(0-, \bar{t}_k)) = -\frac{\bar{y}_k}{t_k}$. The function $t \mapsto y_{-,0}(t)$ is non increasing hence we conclude $y_{k+1} \geq y_k$, $\bar{y}_{k+1} \leq \bar{y}_k$,for all k. Since the sequences $\{y_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}, \{\bar{y}_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ are monotonic, bounded and due to the fact that characteristics do not intersect properly, we conclude

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} y_k = y_0(\text{say}) \leq \lim_{k\to\infty} \bar{y}_k = \bar{y}_0(\text{say}). \tag{15}$$

Exploiting the explicit formula we obtain

$$g'(u(0+, \bar{t}_k)) - g'(u(0+, t_k)) \quad = \quad \frac{-\bar{y}_k t_k + y_k \bar{t}_k}{\bar{t}_k t_k}. \tag{16}$$

As $\lim_{k\to\infty} t_k = t_0$, $\lim_{k\to\infty} \bar{t}_k = t_0$ and (15), the right hand side of (16) converges to some non positive number but due to (14) the left hand side of (16) remain strictly positive, which is a contradiction. This proves claim 1. Therefore $x \mapsto t_+(x,t)$ is strictly decreasing function in $(0, R_1(t))$. Similarly one can prove that $x \mapsto t_-(x,t)$ is a strictly increasing function in $(L_1(t), 0)$. Hence the Lemma. □

REMARK 3.1. *There are no rarefaction start from the interface at any positive time.*

3.2 Explicit formulas connecting the interface

The following two lemmas explains how the solution of (1) at time $t = T$ connected to $t = 0$ via characteristics through the interface.

LEMMA 3.2. *Let $T > 0$ and denote $t_\pm(x, T) = t_\pm(x)$. Then*

1. *For a.e. $x \in [0, R_1(T))$, we have* $-\dfrac{y_{-,0}(t_+(x))}{t_+(x)} = h_+\left(\dfrac{x}{T - t_+(x)}\right)$.
2. *For a.e. $x \in (L_1(T), 0]$, we have* $-\dfrac{y_{+,0}(t_-(x))}{t_-(x)} = h_-\left(\dfrac{x}{T - t_-(x)}\right)$.

Proof. It is enough to prove (1), (2) follows in the same direction. Let $R_1(T) > 0$. Then from (6) of Theorem 2.1, $R(t) > 0$ for $t \in (t_+(R(T))-, T)$ and hence from (5) of Theorem 2.1, $y_{-,0}$ is well defined on $(t_+(R(T)), T)$. Again from (2) of Theorem 2.1, t_+ is a strictly decreasing function, hence the set

$$E_+ = \{t_+^{-1}(D_+)\} \cup \{\text{points of discontinuities of } t_+\}$$

is a countable set. Now from (5) of Theorem 2.1, if $x \notin E_+$, then $t_+(x) \notin D_+$ and hence

$$f(u(0+, t_+(x))) = g(u(0-, t_+(x))),\ g'(u(0-, t_+(x))) = -\frac{y_{-,0}(t_+(x))}{t_+(x)}. \tag{17}$$

From (4) and (5) of Theorem 2.1, we have $f'(u(x,T)) = \frac{x}{T-t_+(x)}$ for a.e. $x \in [0, R_1(T)]$. This implies at the point of continuity of t_+, we have

$$f'(u(x,T)) = f'(u(0+, t_+(x))). \tag{18}$$

Therefore from (17)-(18), for $x \notin E_+$, we conclude the proof of (1). □

LEMMA 3.3. *Let $\rho : [\alpha, \beta] \subset (0,\infty) \to (-\infty, 0)$ be a non decreasing function.*

1. *Let $t : [\alpha,\beta] \to [0,T]$ be a function such that*

$$-\frac{\rho(x)}{t(x)} = h_+\left(\frac{x}{T-t(x)}\right) \text{ a.e. } x \in [\alpha,\beta]. \tag{19}$$

   Then $x \mapsto t(x)$ is a strictly decreasing function.

2. *For $i = 1, 2$, let $t_i : [\alpha,\beta] \to [0,T]$ be two functions such that*

$$-\frac{\rho(x)}{t_i(x)} = h_+\left(\frac{x}{T-t_i(x)}\right) \text{ a.e. } x \in [\alpha,\beta]. \tag{20}$$

   Then $t_1(x) = t_2(x)$, a.e. $x \in [\alpha,\beta]$.

Proof. Let $0 < x_1 < x_2$ and (19) holds at x_1 and x_2. Suppose $t(x_1) \le t(x_2)$. Then $\frac{x_1}{T-t(x_1)} \le \frac{x_1}{T-t(x_2)} < \frac{x_2}{T-t(x_2)}$. Hence

$$-\rho(x_1) = t(x_1)h\left(\frac{x_1}{T-t(x_1)}\right) < t(x_2)h\left(\frac{x_2}{T-t(x_2)}\right) = -\rho(x_2) \le -\rho(x_1),$$

which is a contradiction. This proves (1). Proof of (2) is immediate. □

3.3 Backward wave analysis

The following lemmas proves the existence of possible functions t_+, u_0, given ρ.

LEMMA 3.4. *Let $x_0 > 0, T > t_1 > t_2 > 0$. Define $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$-\frac{\rho_i}{t_i} = h_+\left(\frac{x_0}{T-t_i}\right). \tag{21}$$

Suppose $\rho_1 < \rho_2 < 0$, then there exists a solution $u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}\times[0,T])$ for (1).

Proof. Let us denote a_1, a_2, such that $\frac{x_0}{T-t_i} = f'(a_i)$, for $i = 1, 2$. Then by strict convexity of f, one obtains $a_1 > a_2$. Let us denote b_1, b_2, such that $b_i = g_+^{-1} f_+(a_1)$, for $i = 1, 2$. Consider the line $x - x_0 = \frac{f(a_1)-f(a_2)}{a_1-a_2}(t-T)$, this line hits the $x = 0$ at time $t = T - x_0 s_2 (t-T) = t_3$ (say), where $s_2 = \frac{f(a_1)-f(a_2)}{a_1-a_2}$. Again by strict convexity $t_1 > t_3 > t_2$. Let us define the



Figure 3: The dotted line is the shock originating from the point $(\rho_3, 0)$ until the point (x_0, T).

initial data u_0, by $u_0(x) = b_1 \mathbf{1}_{x<\rho_3} + b_2 \mathbf{1}_{x>\rho_3}$. Due to the construction of $a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2, s_1, s_2, t_3, \rho_3$, the solution in the region $x \in \mathbb{R}, T > t \geq 0$, to the above initial data is given by (see figure 3.3)

$$u(x,t) = \begin{cases} b_1 & \text{if} \quad x - \rho_3 < s_1 t, x < 0, \\ b_2 & \text{if} \quad x - \rho_3 > s_1 t, x < 0, \\ a_1 & \text{if} \quad x < s_2(t - t_3), x > 0, \\ a_2 & \text{if} \quad x > s_2(t - t_3), x > 0. \end{cases} \tag{22}$$

This proves the lemma. □

LEMMA 3.5. *Let $R > 0$. Let us assume that $\rho : [0, R] \to (-\infty, 0)$ and $y : \mathbb{R} \setminus [0, R] \to \mathbb{R}$ be two non decreasing functions satisfies*

$$xy(x) \geq 0 \text{ if } x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus [R, 0] \text{ and } \rho(0) \geq y(x) \text{ if } x \leq 0. \tag{23}$$

Then there exists a solution $u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times [0, \infty))$ of (1) and an unique strictly decreasing function $t : [0, R) \to [0, T)$ such that

$$-\frac{\rho(x)}{t(x)} = h_+\left(\frac{x}{T - t(x)}\right) \text{ a.e. } x \in [0, R), \tag{24}$$

$$u(x, T) = (f')^{-1}\left(\frac{x}{T - t(x)}\right) \text{ a.e. } x \in [0, R). \tag{25}$$

Proof. In order to prove the Lemma, we split into several steps. In step 1, we construct a solution when ρ is constant. By using step 1, we allow ρ to be two constants state in step 2. In step 3, we consider ρ to be an increasing step function in $[0, R)$. Finally in Step 4, we pass to limit and obtain the result.

Step 1: *Let $0 \leq x_1 < x_2, T > 0$ and $\rho : [x_1, x_2] \to (-\infty, 0)$ be a constant function, then there exists a strictly decreasing function $t : [0, x_2] \to [0, T]$ and a solution $u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times [0, \infty))$ of (1) satisfies (24), (25) for a.e. $x \in [x_1, x_2)$.*

Proof of Step 1. Let $\rho(x) = \rho_0 \in (-\infty, 0),\ \forall\ x \in [x_1, x_2]$. Let us consider the initial data u_0 defined in $\mathbb{R}_-$ by $u_0(x) = b_1 \mathbf{1}_{x<\rho_0} + b_2 \mathbf{1}_{x>\rho_0}$, where b_1, b_2 are going to be specify later with the properties, $0 < g'(b_1) < g'(b_2)$ and $T > -\frac{\rho_0}{g'(b_1)} = t_1$ (say), $T > -\frac{\rho_0}{g'(b_2)} = t_2$ (say). Then, for $x < 0, 0 \leq t < T$, the solution $u(x,t)$ of (1) for the above initial data is given by

$$u(x,t) \quad = \quad \begin{cases} b_1 & \text{if } x < g'(b_1)t + \rho_0, \\ (g')^{-1}\left(\frac{x-\rho_0}{t}\right) & \text{if } g'(b_1)t + \rho_0 < x < g'(b_2)t + \rho_0, \\ b_2 & \text{if } x > g'(b_2)t + \rho_0, \end{cases} \tag{26}$$

By R-H condition (4), we define $a_1 = f_+^{-1} g(b_1), a_2 = f_+^{-1} g(b_2)$ and again by R-H condition and (26), for $t \in [0, T]$, we conclude

$$u(0+,t) = a_1 \mathbf{1}_{T \geq t > t_1} + f_+^{-1} g (g')^{-1}\left(\tfrac{-\rho_0}{t}\right) \mathbf{1}_{t_2 < t < t_1} + a_2 \mathbf{1}_{0 \leq t < t_2}, \tag{27}$$

hence for $x > 0, 0 < t \leq T$, the solution is given by

$$u(x,t) \quad = \quad \begin{cases} a_1 & \text{if } x < f'(a_1)(t - t_1), \\ f_+^{-1} g (g')^{-1} u(0+, t_+(x)) & \text{if } f'(a_1)(t-t_1) < x < f'(a_2)(t-t_2), \\ a_2 & \text{if } x > f'(a_2)(t - t_2), \end{cases} \tag{28}$$

where $t_+ : [f'(a_1)(T - t_1), f'(a_2)(T - t_2)] \to [t_1, t_2]$ is a homeomorphism,



Figure 4: A rarefaction originating from the point $(\rho_0, 0)$.

the existence of such homeomorphism is quite obvious. Note that the lines $x = f'(a_1)(t - t_1), x = f'(a_2)(t - t_2)$, hits $t = T$ at $x = f'(a_1)(T - t_1)$ and

$x = f'(a_1)(T - t_2)$ respectively. Now we are interested to solve the following equation for (a_1, a_2) and (b_1, b_2), i.e, given x_1, x_2, ρ_0, find pairs (a_1, a_2) and (b_1, b_2) such that

$$x_1 = f'(a_1)(T + \tfrac{\rho_0}{g'(b_1)}),\ x_2 = f'(a_2)(T + \tfrac{\rho_0}{g'(b_2)}). \tag{29}$$

In order to solve the above equation (29), we need to consider following 2 cases.

Case 1: If $f(\theta_f) \leq g(\theta_g)$: We consider the function $S_1 : [\theta_g, \infty] \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by $S_1(x) = f' g_+^{-1} f(x) \left(T + \frac{\rho_0}{g'(x)}\right)$. Then S_1 is a continuous function with $S_1(\theta_g) = -\infty$, $S_1(\infty) = \infty$. Therefore by using Intermediate Value Theorem we conclude the existence of pairs $(a_1, a_2), (b_1, b_2)$ satisfying (29).

Case 2: If $f(\theta_f) > g(\theta_g)$: The argument is similar to case 1.

Now we define a strictly decreasing function $t : [0, x_2] \to [0, T]$, by

$$t(x) = \begin{cases} T - \frac{x}{f'(a_1)} & \text{if} \quad 0 \leq x < f'(a_1)(t - t_1), \\ t_+(x) & \text{if} \quad f'(a_1)(t - t_1) < x < f'(a_2)(t - t_2), \\ T - \frac{x}{f'(a_2)} & \text{if} \quad x_2 > x > f'(a_2)(t - t_2). \end{cases} \tag{30}$$

From (26), (27), (28) and (30), it is easy to check (24), (25) for a.e. $x \in [x_1, x_2]$. Which proves Step 1.

Step 2: *Let $0 \leq x_1 < x_2 < x_3, T > 0$ and $\rho : [x_1, x_3] \to (-\infty, 0)$ be such that $\rho(x) = \rho_1 \mathbf{1}_{[x_1, x_2]} + \rho_2 \mathbf{1}_{[x_2, x_3]}$ where ρ_1, ρ_2 are two constants such that $\rho_1 < \rho_2 < 0$. Then there exists a strictly decreasing function $t : [0, x_3] \to [0, T]$ and a solution $u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times [0, \infty))$ of (1) satisfies (24), (25) for a.e. $x \in [0, x_3)$.*

Proof of Step 2. Consider the function ρ in $[x_1, x_2]$, then by Step 1, there exists pairs (a_1, a_2) (say), (t_1, t_2) (say) and (b_1, b_2) (say) as in (29). Similarly considering the function ρ in $[x_2, x_3]$ and using Step 1, there exists other pairs (a_3, a_4), (t_3, t_4) (say) and (b_3, b_4) as in (29). Then by construction $t_2 > t_3$ and it satisfies

$$-\frac{\rho_1}{t_2} = h_+ \left(\frac{x_2}{T - t_2}\right),\ -\frac{\rho_2}{t_3} = h_+ \left(\frac{x_2}{T - t_3}\right).$$

Now by Lemma 3.4 and Step 1, there exists $S \in (\rho_1, \rho_2)$ which allow us to construct the following initial data defined in $\mathbb{R}_-$ by $u_0(x) = b_1 \mathbf{1}_{x < \rho_1} + b_2 \mathbf{1}_{\rho_1 < x < S} + b_3 \mathbf{1}_{S < x < \rho_2} + b_4 \mathbf{1}_{x > \rho_2}$. Then the corresponding solution in the region $\{x < 0, 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ is given by (see figure 3.3)

$$u(x,t) = \begin{cases} b_1 & \text{if} \quad x < g'(b_1)t + \rho_1, \\ (g')^{-1}\left(\frac{x - \rho_1}{t}\right) & \text{if} \quad g'(b_1)t + \rho_1 < x < g'(b_2)t + \rho_1, \\ b_2 & \text{if} \quad g'(b_2)t + \rho_1 < x < \frac{g(b_2) - g(b_3)}{b_2 - b_3}t + S, \\ b_3 & \text{if} \quad \frac{g(b_2) - g(b_3)}{b_2 - b_3}t + S < x < g'(b_3)t + \rho_2, \\ (g')^{-1}\left(\frac{x - \rho_2}{t}\right) & \text{if} \quad g'(b_3)t + \rho_2 < x < g'(b_4)t + \rho_2, \\ b_4 & \text{if} \quad g'(b_4)t + \rho_2 < x. \end{cases} \tag{31}$$



Figure 5: An illustration Step 2.

By R-H condition (4), we define $a_i = f_+^{-1}g(b_i)$, for $i = 1, \cdots, 4$. Again by R-H condition and (31), the solution in the region $\{x > 0, 0 < t \leq T\}$, is given by

$$u(x,t) = \begin{cases} a_1 & \text{if} \quad x < f'(a_1)(t-t_1), \\ f_+^{-1}g(g')^{-1}u(0+,t_+(x)) & \text{if} \quad f'(a_1)(t-t_1) < x < f'(a_2)(t-t_2), \\ a_2 & \text{if} \quad f'(a_2)(t-t_2) < x < \tilde{S}_1\left(t + \frac{S}{\tilde{S}_2}\right), \\ a_3 & \text{if} \quad \tilde{S}_1\left(t + \frac{S}{\tilde{S}_2}\right) < x < f'(a_3)(t-t_3), \\ f_+^{-1}g(g')^{-1}u(0+,t_+(x)) & \text{if} \quad f'(a_3)(t-t_3) < x < f'(a_4)(t-t_4), \\ a_4 & \text{if} \quad f'(a_4)(t-t_4) > x, \end{cases} \tag{32}$$

where $\tilde{S}_1 = \left(\frac{f(a_2)-f(a_3)}{a_2-a_3}\right)$, $\tilde{S}_2 = \frac{g(b_2)-g(b_3)}{b_2-b_3}$ and $t_+ : [f'(a_1)(T-t_1), f'(a_2)(T-t_2)] \cup f'(a_3)(T-t_3), f'(a_4)(T-t_4)] \to [t_1,t_2] \cup [t_3,t_4]$ is a homeomorphism. Then we define a strictly decreasing function $t : [0,x_3] \to [0,T]$ by $t(x) = \left(T - \frac{x}{f'(a_1)}\right)\mathbf{1}_{[0,f'(a_1)(t-t_1)]} + t_+(x)\mathbf{1}_{[0,x_3]\setminus[0,f'(a_1)(t-t_1)]}$. Therefore from definition of t, (31) and (32), it is easy to check (24), (25) for a.e. $x \in [0,x_3]$. Which proves Step 2.

Step 3: *Discretization of both the functions ρ, y by piecewise constant and develop a solution with a piecewise constant initial data such that (24), (25) holds for each discretized function ρ_N.*

In the present step our aim to create a piecewise constant initial data in the region $[y(0), y(R)]$. Initial data $\bar{u}_0^N$ (say) in the region $\mathbb{R}\setminus[y(0), y(R)]$ can be construct in the same way as in Lemma 3.6 of [2]. In order to do that we first discretized ρ to piecewise constants. Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\rho(0) = z_1 < z_2 < \cdots < z_N = \rho(R)$ be such that $|z_i - z_{i+1}| < \frac{1}{N}$ for $i = 1, \cdots, N-1$. We define $\rho^{-1}[z_1, z_{i+1}] = [x_0, x_i]$, then $0 = x_0 \leq x_1 \cdots \leq x_N = R$. Let us define a new

function $\rho_N : [0, R] \to (-\infty, 0)$ by $\rho_N(x) = z_1 \mathbf{1}_{[x_0,x_1]} + \sum_{i=2}^{N-1} z_i \mathbf{1}_{(x_i,x_{i+1}]}(x)$. By definition of ρ_N, we have $|\rho_N - \rho(x)| < \frac{1}{N}$, for $x \in (0, R)$. For $i = 1, \cdots, N-1$, we consider ρ_N in each interval $[x_i, x_{i+1}]$ and apply step 1 and step 2, then for each $[x_i, x_{i+1}]$ there exist pairs $(b_{2i+1}, b_{2i+2}), (a_{2i+1}, a_{2i+2}), (t_{2i+1}, t_{2i+2})$ and $S_i \in (z_i, z_{i+1})$. Also the following equation satisfies for $i = 1, \cdots, N-1$,

$$-\frac{\rho_i}{t_{2i}} = h_+\left(\tfrac{x_i}{T-t_{2i}}\right), \; -\tfrac{\rho_{i+1}}{t_{2i+1}} = h_+\left(\frac{x_i}{T-t_{2i+1}}\right).$$

Hence we obtain the following piecewise constant initial data in the region



Figure 6: An illustration of Step 3.

$[z_1, z_N]$, combining $\bar{u}_0 \in \mathbb{R} \setminus [y(0), y(R)]$ we obtain the following initial data u_0^N (say), given by (see figure 3.3)

$$u_0^N(x) = \begin{cases} \bar{u}_0^N(y(0)-) & \text{if} \quad x \in [y(0), \bar{S}^N], \\ b_1 & \text{if} \quad x \in [S_0, z_1], \\ b_{2i} & \text{if} \quad x \in [z_i, S_i], \text{ for } i = 1, \cdots, N-1, \\ b_{2i+1} & \text{if} \quad x \in [S_i, z_{i+1}], \text{ for } i = 1, \cdots, N-1, \\ b_{2N} & \text{if} \quad x \in [z_N, 0], \text{ for } i = 1, \cdots, N-1, \\ \bar{u}_0^N(y(R)+) & \text{if} \quad x \in [0, y(R)], \\ \bar{u}_0^N & \text{if} \quad x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus [y(0), y(R)], \end{cases} \tag{33}$$

where $-\bar{S}^N = \dfrac{g(\bar{u}_0^N(y(0)-)) - g(b_1)}{\bar{u}_0^N(y(0)-) - b_1}$. Now similarly as in Step 1, Step 2 there is a homeomorphism denoting by $t^N : \cup_{i=1}^{N-1}[f'(a_i)(T-t_i), f'(a_2)(T-t_2)] \to \cup_{i=1}^{N-1}[t_i, t_{i+1}]$. Which is a strictly decreasing function from $[0, R] \to [0, T]$ and by using the explicit formula it is easy to check (24), (25) for a.e. $x \in [0, R]$. Let us denote the corresponding solution u^N of the initial data u_0^N, then it is to be noticed that the construction has been done such a way that the shocks are discrete in the region $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}$.

Step 4: *Passage to the limit: in this step we prove up to a subsequence u_0^N converges to some u_0 in L^1_{loc} and the corresponding solution u^N also converges to the solution u up to a subsequence and finally (24), (25) holds.*

By definition, $\rho^N \to \rho(x)$ point-wise and by Helly's theorem there exists a subsequence (after relabeling) such that $t^N(x) \to t(x)$ (say) a.e.. Hence the relation (24) holds for $\rho(\cdot), t(\cdot)$, for a.e. $x \in [0, R]$. Let us fix $C_1 \in (0, R)$. Since from Lemma 3.3, $t(\cdot)$ is strictly decreasing in $[0, R]$, hence there exists a constant $C_2 > 0$, such that for $x \in (0, C_1)$, $t_+(x) > C_2 > 0$ and $\frac{x}{T-t(x)} < \frac{R}{T-t(C_1)}$ for $x \in (C_1, R)$. Therefore, there exists constant $C_3 > 0$ such that

$$\left|\frac{\rho(x)}{t(x)}\right| \leq \frac{\rho(0)}{C_2} \quad \text{if} \quad x \in (0, R), \tag{34}$$

$$\left|h_+\left(\frac{x}{T-t(x)}\right)\right| \leq C_3 \quad \text{if} \quad x \in (C_1, R). \tag{35}$$

Whence (34), (35) and Step 3 allow us to assume that up to a subsequence (after relabeling)

$$\left|\frac{\rho(x)}{t^N(x)}\right| = \left|h_+\left(\frac{x}{T-t^N(x)}\right)\right| \leq C_4 \quad \text{if} \quad x \in [0, R], \tag{36}$$

for some constant $C_4 > 0$. By using the explicit formula and (36), there exist a constant C_5, such that

$$\text{Max}\left\{||u_0^N||_\infty, ||u_N||_\infty, \left\|\frac{d\xi}{dt}\right\|_\infty\right\} \leq C_5, \tag{37}$$

where ξ be any characteristic associated to initial data u_0^N. Let us consider any partition $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^K$ for the interval $(\rho(0), \rho(R))$. Then by explicit formula and by our construction in Step 3, there exists corresponding partition $\{t_i\}_{i=1}^K$ in the interval $(0, T)$ such that $g'(u_0^N(p_i)) = -\frac{y^N_{-,0}(t_{i+1})}{t_{i+1}}$, moreover due to the fact that $\rho(R) < 0$ and (37),

$$\frac{1}{t_i} \leq C_6, \tag{38}$$

for some constant $C_6 > 0$. Now by using explicit formula and using (38) there exist a constant $C_7 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} TV(g'(u_0^N) : (\rho(0), \rho(R))) &= \sup_K \sum_{i=1}^K \left|\frac{y^N_{-,0}(t_{i+1})}{t_{i+1}} - \frac{y^N_{-,0}(t_i)}{t_i}\right| \\ &\leq \sup_K (C_6)^2 \sum_{i=1}^K |t_{i+1} - t_i||y^N_{-,0}(t_{i+1})| \\ &+ \sup_K (C_6)^2 \sum_{i=1}^K |t_i||y^N_{-,0}(t_{i+1}) - y^N_{-,0}(t_i)| \\ &\leq \sup_K (C_6)^2\{|\rho(0)|T + T|\rho(0) - \rho(R)|\} \\ &= T(C_6)^2\{|\rho(0)| + |\rho(0) - \rho(R)|\}. \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

Similarly as in (39) one can prove $BV_{loc}(g'(u_0^N(0-,t)) : (0,T)) \leq C_7$, for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Thanks to Helly's Theorem, there exists subsequence (after relabeling) such that $\{g'(u_0^N)\}$ converges point-wise to some function Q (say) in $(\rho(0), \rho(R))$. Then define $\tilde{u}_0(x) = (g')^{-1}Q(x)$, therefore $u_0^N \to \tilde{u}_0$ in $L^1(\rho(0), \rho(R))$. It can be shown that $\bar{u}_0^N \to \bar{u}_0$ (say) in $L^1(\mathbb{R} \setminus [y(0), y(R)])$. Again by Helly's Theorem, there exists subsequence (after relabeling) $u_0^N(0-,t) \to u(0-,t)$ (say) a.e. $t \in [0,T]$ and so $u_0^N(0+,t) \to u(0+,t)$ (say) for a.e. $t \in [0,T]$. Now we consider the following two boundary value problems

$$\begin{cases} W_t^N + f(W^N)_x = 0, & \text{if } x > 0, t \in [0,T] \\ W^N(t,0) = u^N(0+,t), & \text{if } t \in [0,T] \\ W^N(x,0) = u_0^N(x) \mid_{(0,\infty)}, & \text{if } x > 0. \end{cases} \tag{40}$$

$$\begin{cases} V_t^N + g(V^N)_x = 0, & \text{if } x < 0, t \in [0,T] \\ V^N(t,0) = u^N(0-,t), & \text{if } t \in [0,T] \\ V^N(x,0) = u_0^N(x) \mid_{(-\infty,0)}, & \text{if } x < 0. \end{cases} \tag{41}$$

Then one can follow a similar strategy as in 'proof of Lemma 2.1 and 2.2' of [1] to conclude that $W^N \to W$, $V^N \to V$ in L^1_{loc} and the limits W, V is the entropy solutions to the above boundary value problems with boundary data $u(0+,t), u(0-,t)$ and the initial data $u_0 \mid_{(0,\infty)}, u_0 \mid_{(-\infty,0)}$ respectively. Then define a new function $Z^N : \mathbb{R} \times [0,T] \to \mathbb{R}$ by $Z^N = V^N \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}_- \times [0,T]} + W^N \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+ \times [0,T]}$. Therefore $Z^N \to Z$ in L^1_{loc}, for some Z. It is easy to check that Z^N is a weak solution of (1). Due to the construction, Z^N satisfies R-H condition, interface entropy condition and (24) for each N and hence these properties holds in the limit Z. Again $W^N(x,T) = (f')^{-1}\left(\frac{x}{T - t^N(x)}\right)$ for a.e. $x \in (0,R)$ and passing to the limit up to a subsequence $Z(x,T) := W(x,T) = (f')^{-1}\left(\frac{x}{T-t(x)}\right)$ a.e. $x \in (0,R)$. This completes the proof of the Lemma. □

The following Lemma holds in the same spirit as Lemma 3.5.

LEMMA 3.6. *Let $R < 0$. Let us assume that $\rho : [R,0] \to (0,\infty)$ and $y : \mathbb{R} \setminus [R,0] \to \mathbb{R}$ be two non decreasing functions satisfies*

$$xy(x) \geq 0 \text{ if } x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus [R,0] \text{ and } y(x) \geq \rho(0) \text{ if } x \geq 0. \tag{42}$$

Then there exists a solution $u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times [0,\infty))$ of (1) and an unique strictly increasing function $t : [R,0] \to [0,T]$ such that for a.e. $x \in [R,0]$, we have

$$-\frac{\rho(x)}{t(x)} = h_-\left(\frac{x}{T - t(x)}\right), \; u(x,T) = (g')^{-1}\left(\frac{x}{T-t(x)}\right).$$

4 Optimal control for discontinuous flux

Class of target function: Let $0 < C$. Let k be a measurable function on $\mathbb{R}$. Define a new function $\eta : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ by $\eta[k](x) = g'(k(x))\mathbf{1}_{x\leq 0} + f'(k(x))\mathbf{1}_{x>0}$. Then Supp $\eta[k](x) \subset [-C, C]$ if and only if $k(x) = \theta_g$ for $x < -C$ and $k(x) = \theta_f$ for $x > C$.
Admissible class of initial data: Let us define a new function $\bar{\theta} : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ by $\bar{\theta}(x) = H(x)\theta_f + (1 - H(x))\theta_g$. Then Admissible class of initial data A, is defined by

$$A = \{u_0(x) = z(x) + \bar{\theta}(x) \ : \ z \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}) \text{ with compact support}\}. \tag{43}$$

Cost functional: Fix a $T > 0$ and for $u_0 \in A$, let u be the corresponding solution to (1) associated to the initial data u_0. We define the cost functional J by

$$\begin{aligned} J(u_0) \ &= \int_{-\infty}^{L_1(T)} |g'(u(x,T)) - \eta[k](x)|^2 dx + \int_{L_1(T)}^{0} |f' f_-^{-1} g(u(x,T)) - \eta[k](x)|^2 dx \\ &+ \int_{0}^{R_1(T)} |g' g_+^{-1} f(u(x,T)) - \eta[k](x)|^2 dx + \int_{R_1(T)}^{\infty} |f'(u(x,T)) - \eta[k](x)|^2 dx. \end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

Optimal control problem: Then the question is to find the optimal control $u_0 \in A$ so that, one has

$$J(u_0) = \min_{w_o \in A} J(w_0). \tag{45}$$

THEOREM 4.1. *There exists a minimizer for (45).*

Let us define the following admissible class of initial data. Let $T > 0$. In order to mention simple notations we denote $R(t), L(t)$ instead of $R_1(t), L_1(t)$.

We consider the following two admissible class of initial data

$$A_1 = \{u_0 \in A : \ L(T, u_0) = 0\} \text{ and } A_2 = \{u_0 \in A : \ R(T, u_0) = 0\}.$$

From (6) of Theorem 2.1, $A = A_1 \cup A_2$. $R(T, u_0), L(T, u_0)$, denotes the R_1, L_1 curves as in Theorem 2.1 with respect to the initial data u_0.

In view of (6) of Theorem 2.1, we conclude

$$\min_{u_o \in A} J(u_0) = \min\{\min_{u_o \in A_1} J(u_0), \min_{u_o \in A_2} J(u_0)\}. \tag{46}$$

Hence finding a minimum in (45) is equivalent to find minimum of the functional J over the sets A_1, A_2.

LEMMA 4.1. *For $u_0 \in A$, $J(u_0)$ is well defined.*

Proof. Because of finite speed of propagation, it is immediate. □

Existence of minimizer over the set A_1: Let us define a new admissible set

$$\tilde{A}_1 = \big\{(R(T),\rho,y): \quad i).\ \rho:[0,R(T)]\to(-\infty,0] \text{ be a non increasing function},\ ii).\ y:\mathbb{R}\setminus[0,R(T)]\to\mathbb{R} \text{ be a non decreasing function},\ iii).\ xy(x)\geq 0, \text{ and } y(x)\leq\rho(0) \text{ for all } x\leq 0\big\}.$$

From Lemma 3.5, for $(R(T),\rho,y)$, there exists a unique non increasing function t such that

$$-\frac{\rho(x)}{t(x)} = h_+\left(\frac{x}{T-t(x)}\right), \text{ a.e. } x\in(0,R(T)).$$

Let us define a new cost functional $\tilde{J}$ associated with the admissible set $\tilde{A}_1$ by

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{J}(R(T),\rho,y) = \int_{-\infty}^{0} |\tfrac{x-y(x)}{T} - \eta[k](x)|^2dx &+ \int_{0}^{R(T)} |-\tfrac{\rho(x)}{t(x)} - \eta[k](x)|^2dx \\ &+ \int_{R(T)}^{\infty} |\tfrac{x-y(x)}{T} - \eta[k](x)|^2dx.\end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

Then from (44), we have

$$\inf_{(R(T),\rho,y)\in\tilde{A}_1} \tilde{J}(R(T),\rho,y) \leq \inf_{u_0\in A_1} J(u_0). \tag{48}$$

Estimations: Let Supp $\eta[k]\subset[-C,C]$. $(0,0,x)\in\tilde{A}_1$ and $\tilde{J}(0,0,x) = \|\eta[k]\|^2_{L^2}$. Hence

$$\inf_{(R(T),\rho,y)\in\tilde{A}_1} \tilde{J}(R(T),\rho,y) \leq \|\eta[k]\|^2_{L^2}.$$

Let $(R(T),\rho,y)\in\tilde{A}_1$ be such that $\tilde{J}(R(T),\rho,y)\leq 2\|\eta[k]\|^2_{L^2}$. Suppose $R(T)>C$, then

$$2\|\eta[k]\|^2_{L^2} \geq \tilde{J}(R(T),\rho,y) \geq \int_{C}^{R(t)} \left|\tfrac{\rho(x)}{t(x)}\right|^2 dx = \int_{C}^{R(t)} \left|h_+\left(\tfrac{x}{T-t(x)}\right)\right|^2 dx.$$

Since h_+ is an increasing function and $\left(\frac{x}{T-t(x)}\right)\geq\frac{x}{T}$, we obtain $2\|\eta[k]\|^2_{L^2}\geq \int_{C}^{R(t)} \left|h_+\left(\frac{x}{T}\right)\right|^2 dx \to\infty$ as $R(T)\to\infty$. Hence there exists $R_0\geq C$ such that $R(T)\leq R_0$. Now for $x\leq 0, y(x)\leq\rho(0)$, which implies $x-y(x)\geq x-\rho(0)>0$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}2\|\eta[k]\|^2_{L^2} \geq \int_{\rho(0)}^{0} \left|\tfrac{x-y(x)}{T} - \eta[k](x)\right|^2 dx &\geq \tfrac{1}{2}\int_{\rho(0)}^{0} \left|\tfrac{x-y(x)}{T}\right|^2 dx - \|\eta[k]\|^2_{L^2} \\ &\geq \tfrac{1}{2}\int_{\rho(0)}^{0} \left|\tfrac{x-\rho(0)}{T}\right|^2 dx - \|\eta[k]\|^2_{L^2} \\ &= \tfrac{1}{6T^2}|\rho(0)|^2 - \|\eta[k]\|^2_{L^2}.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$|\rho(0)| \leq \left(18T^2\|\eta[k]\|_{L^2}^2\right)^{1/3} = \rho_0(\text{say}). \tag{49}$$

Since $0 \geq \rho(x) \geq \rho(0)$, hence from Lemma 3.5 and (49), we have

(i). If $t(x) \leq T/2$, then $T - t(x) \geq T/2$, which implies $\frac{x}{T-t(x)} \leq \frac{2x}{T} \leq \frac{2R_0}{T}$.

(ii). If $t(x) \geq T/2$, then $h_+\left(\frac{x}{T-t(x)}\right) = -\frac{\rho(x)}{t(x)} \leq \frac{2|\rho(0)|}{T}$

and hence there exists a $\Lambda > 0$ such that $\frac{x}{T-t(x)} \leq \Lambda$. Define $\tilde{y}$ by

$$\tilde{y}(x) \quad = \quad \begin{cases} y(x) & \text{if} \quad x \in [-C, 0], \\ x & \text{if} \quad y(-C) \geq -C \text{ and } x < -C, \\ y(-C) & \text{if} \quad y(-C) \leq -C \text{ and } x \in [y(-C), -C], \\ x & \text{if} \quad x \leq y(-C). \end{cases} \tag{50}$$

Then

$$\tilde{y}(x) = y(x)\mathbf{1}_{[-C,0]} + \min\{-C, y(-C)\}\mathbf{1}_{[\min\{-C,y(-C)\},-C)} + x\mathbf{1}_{\{x<\min\{-C,y(-C)\}\}}.$$

and therefore

$$\tilde{y}(x) = y(x)\mathbf{1}_{[R(T),R_0]} + \max\{y(R_0), R_0\}\mathbf{1}_{(R_0,\max\{R_0,y(R_0)\}]} + x\mathbf{1}_{\{x>\max\{R_0,y(R_0)\}\}}.$$

Hence if $y(-C) < -C$, then for $x \in [y(-x), -C$, $y(x) \leq y(-C) = \tilde{y}(x)$ which implies $\frac{x-y(x)}{T} \geq \frac{x-\tilde{y}(x)}{T} = \frac{x-y(-C)}{T} > 0$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-\infty}^{0} \left|\tfrac{x-y}{T} - \eta[k]\right|^2 &= \int_{-\infty}^{y(-C)} \left|\tfrac{x-y}{T}\right|^2 + \int_{y(-C)}^{-C} \left|\tfrac{x-y}{T}\right|^2 + \int_{-C}^{0} \left|\tfrac{x-y}{T} - \eta[k]\right|^2 \\ &\geq \int_{-\infty}^{y(-C)} \left|\tfrac{x-\tilde{y}}{T}\right|^2 + \int_{y(-C)}^{-C} \left|\tfrac{x-y(-C)}{T}\right|^2 + \int_{-C}^{0} \left|\tfrac{x-y}{T} - \eta[k]\right|^2 \\ &\geq \tfrac{(-C-y(-C))^3}{3T^2}, \end{aligned}$$

and if $y(R_0) > R_0$, then

$$\int_{R(T)}^{\infty} \left|\tfrac{x-y}{T} - \eta[k]\right|^2 \geq \int_{R_0}^{\infty} \left|\tfrac{x-y}{T}\right|^2 \geq \int_{R_0}^{y(R_0)} \left|\tfrac{x-\tilde{y}}{T}\right|^2 = \tfrac{(y(R_0)-R_0)^3}{3T^2}.$$

Since $\tilde{J}(R(T), y, \rho) \leq 2\|\eta[k]\|_{L^2}^2$, hence $|-C - y(-C)|^3 \leq 6T^2\|\eta[k]\|_{L^2}^2$ and $|y(R_0) - R_0|^3 \leq 6T^2\|\eta[k]\|_{L^2}^2$. Therefore $y(-C) \geq -C - (6T^2\|\eta[k]\|_{L^2}^2)^{1/3}$ and $y(R_0) \leq R_0 + (6T^2\|\eta[k]\|_{L^2}^2)^{1/3}$. Again by construction, $\tilde{J}(R(T), \rho, y) \geq \tilde{J}(R(T), \rho, \tilde{y})$. Let us denote $M_1 = R_0 + (6T^2\|\eta[k]\|_{L^2}^2)^{1/3}$. Then we obtain the following

LEMMA 4.2. *Let R_0, ρ_0, M_1 be defined as above and define a new class of admissible set $\bar{A}_1$, by*

$$\bar{A}_1 = \{(R(T), \rho, y) : \ 0 \le R(T) \le R_0, \ \rho_0 \le \rho \le 0, \ y(x) = x \text{ if } x \notin [-M_1, M_1]\}.$$

Then

$$\inf_{\bar{A}_1} \tilde{J} = \inf_{A_1} \tilde{J}.$$

LEMMA 4.3. *There exists $(\bar{R}(T), \bar{\rho}, \bar{y}) \in \bar{A}_1$ such that*

$$\inf_{(R(T),\rho,y)\in\bar{A}_1} \tilde{J}(R(T), \rho, y) = \tilde{J}(\bar{R}(T), \bar{\rho}, \bar{y}). \tag{51}$$

Proof. Proof is trivial due to Helly's theorem. □

4.1 Proof of Theorem 4.1

Proof. Let $\bar{R}(T), \bar{\rho}, \bar{y}$ be as in Lemma 4.3, then the desired initial data can be constructed from Lemmas 3.5 and 3.6. □

5 Exact control problem for discontinuous flux

Reachable set: Let $T, C_1, C_2, B_1, B_2, R \in \mathbb{R}$ be given so that $T > 0, C_1 < 0 < C_2, \ B_1 < 0 < B_2$. Let $\delta > 0$ be an arbitrary small number such that $B_1 + \delta < 0, B_2 - \delta > 0$. Then in order to define *Reachable set* we need to consider the following 2 cases.

Case 1: $R \in (0, C_2)$.

Let us consider any non decreasing functions $y : [C_1, 0] \cup [R, C_2] \to [B_1 + \delta, B_2 - \delta]$ and $\rho : [0, R] \to [B_1 - \delta, 0]$ which satisfies $xy(x) \ge 0$ for all $x \in [C_1, 0] \cup [R, C_2]$ and $y(x) \le \rho(0)$ for all $x \in [C_1, 0]$. Then by Lemma 3.5 there exists a unique non increasing function $t : [0, R] \to [0, T]$, which satisfies $-\frac{\rho(x)}{t(x)} = h_+ \left(\frac{x}{T - t(x)}\right)$ *a.e.x* $\in (0, R)$.

Let $\rho(\cdot), y(\cdot), t(\cdot)$ be as above then we define a function $W : [C_1, C_2] \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} W(x) = (g')^{-1}\left(\tfrac{x-y(x)}{T}\right)\mathbf{1}_{[C_1,0]} \quad & +(f')^{-1}\left(\tfrac{x}{T-t(x)}\right)\mathbf{1}_{[0,R]} \\ & +(f')^{-1}\left(\tfrac{x-y(x)}{T}\right)\mathbf{1}_{[R,C_2]}. \end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

Then we define the *Reachable set* associated $T, \delta, R, C_1, C_2, B_1, B_2$ by

$$\textit{Reachable set}_+ = \{W : [C_1, C_2] \to \mathbb{R} \text{ satisfies (52)}\}.$$

Case 2: $R \in (C_1, 0)$.

Let us consider any non decreasing functions $y : [C_1, R] \cup [0, C_2] \to [B_1 +$

$\delta, B_2 - \delta]$ and $\rho : [R, 0] \to [0, B_2 + \delta]$ which satisfies $xy(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in [C_1, R] \cup [0, C_2]$ and $\rho(0) \leq y(x)$, for all $x \in [0, C_2]$. Then by Lemma 3.5 there exists a unique non increasing function $t : [R, 0] \to [0, T]$, which satisfies $-\frac{\rho(x)}{t(x)} = h_-\left(\frac{x}{T-t(x)}\right)$ $a.e.x \in (R, 0)$.
Let $\rho(\cdot), y(\cdot), t(\cdot)$ be as above then we define a function $W : [C_1, C_2] \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} W(x) = (g')^{-1}\left(\tfrac{x-y(x)}{T}\right)\mathbf{1}_{[C_1,R]} \quad & +(g')^{-1}\left(\tfrac{x}{T-t(x)}\right)\mathbf{1}_{[R,0]} \\ & +(f')^{-1}\left(\tfrac{x-y(x)}{T}\right)\mathbf{1}_{[0,C_2]}. \end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

Then we define the *Reachable set* associated $T, \delta, R, C_1, C_2, B_1, B_2$ by

$$\textit{Reachable set}_- = \{W : [C_1, C_2] \to \mathbb{R} \text{ satisfies (53)}\}.$$

Finally clubbing Case 1 and Case 2, we define

$$\textit{Reachable set} = \textit{Reachable set}_+ \cup \textit{Reachable set}_-.$$

THEOREM 5.1. *Let $T > 0, C_1 < 0 < C_2, B_1 < 0 < B_2$. Assume that $\bar{u}_0 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R} \setminus (B_1, B_2))$ and $W \in$ Reachable set. Then there exist a solution $u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times (0, T))$ of (1) such that*

$$u(x, T) = W(x) \quad x \in (C_1, C_2), \tag{54}$$

$$u(x, 0) = u_0(x)\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}\setminus(B_1,B_2)} + \bar{u}_0(x)\mathbf{1}_{(B_1,B_2)} \tag{55}$$

In order to prove the above Theorem, we need the following free region Lemmas and the backward construction Lemmas 3.5,3.6.

LEMMA 5.1. *Let $0 < B_2, 0 < C_2$. Let us assume that $u_0 \in L^\infty(B_2, \infty)$ be given. Let $P_2 > C_2$ be any number, then there exists $\lambda_2 > 0$ and a solution $u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+ \times [0, T])$ of the following system*

$$\begin{aligned} u_t + f(u)_x &= 0 \quad \text{if } (x,t) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times (0,T), \\ u(x,t) &= \lambda_2 \text{ if } (x,t) \in Q_2, \\ u(x,0) &= u_0 \text{ if } x \in (B_2, \infty), \end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

where the domain Q_2, is given by $Q_2 = \{(x,t) : 0 \leq t \leq T, 0 \leq x \leq (t-T)\frac{P_2-B_2}{T} + P_2\}$.

Proof. One can choose $u_0(x) = \lambda_2$, for $x \in (0, B_2)$, where λ_2 is some large positive number. Roughly speaking, the superlinear growth of f allows a large shock due to λ_2, which kills the given u_0 in (B_2, ∞). The rigorous proof follows as in the same spirit of the free region Lemmas 2.2, 2.3, 2.4 as in [1]. □

LEMMA 5.2. *Let $B_1 < 0, C_1 < 0$. Let us assume that $u_0 \in L^\infty(-\infty, B_1)$ be given. Let $P_1 < C_1$ be any number, then there exists $\lambda_1 < 0$ and a solution $u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_- \times [0,T])$ of the following system*

$$\begin{aligned} u_t + g(u)_x &= 0 \quad \text{if } (x,t) \in \mathbb{R}_- \times (0,T), \\ u(x,t) &= \lambda_1 \text{ if } (x,t) \in Q_1, \\ u(x,0) &= u_0 \text{ if } x \in (-\infty, B_1), \end{aligned} \tag{57}$$

where the domain Q_1, is given by $Q_1 = \{(x,t) : 0 \le t \le T, 0 \ge x \ge (t-T)\frac{P_1 - B_1}{T} + P_1\}$.

Proof. Similarly by choosing $u_0(x) = \lambda_1$, for $x \in (B_1, 0)$, where λ_2 is some large negative number. Proof is similar like as in the previous lemma. □



Figure 7: An illustration of the Theorem

Proof of Theorem 5.1. Let $\delta > 0$ be an arbitrary small number. Then define an initial data in the domain $(B_1, B_1, +\delta) \cup (B_2 - \delta, B_2)$ by $u_0(x) = \lambda_1 \mathbf{1}_{(B_1, B_1, +\delta)} + \lambda_2 \mathbf{1}_{(B_2 - \delta, B_2)}$, where λ_1 and λ_2 are as in Lemma 5.2 and Lemma 5.1 respectively. From the above two Lemmas it is clear that in the region $Q_1 \cup Q_2$ there is no influence of the given initial data $u_0 \in \mathbb{R} \setminus (B_1, B_2)$, which allow us to use the backward construction Lemma 3.5, 3.6 in the domain $Q_1 \cup Q_2$. Let us consider Case 1, i.e., consider any $R \in (0, C_2)$. Then given $\rho(\cdot), t(\cdot), y(\cdot)$, we apply Lemma 3.5. Therefore given any $W(x) \in$ *Reachable set*$_+$, we obtain a solution $u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times (0,T))$ of (1) such that $u(x,T) = W(x)$ for $x \in (C_1, C_2)$. Similarly one can construct a solution by using Lemma 3.6 when $W(x) \in$ *Reachable set*$_-$. Hence the theorem. □

REMARK 5.1. *Due to the explicit formulas (6), (7) in Theorem 2.1, the reachable set in Theorem 5.1 is optimal.*

Acknowledgments

The first author would like to thank Gran Sasso Science Institute, L'Aquila, Italy for the hospitality during his visit and also IFCAM for the funding.

References

[1] Adimurthi, S. S. Ghoshal and G. D. Veerappa Gowda, Exact controllability of scalar conservation law with strict convex flux, *Math. Control Relat. Fields.*, **04**, (2014), 401–449.

[2] Adimurthi, S. S. Ghoshal and G.D. Veerappa Gowda, Optimal controllability for scalar conservation law with convex flux, *J. Hyperbolic Differ. Equ.*, **11**, (2014), 477–491.

[3] Adimurthi, S. S. Ghoshal and G. D. Veerappa Gowda, Structure of an entropy solution of a scalar conservation law with strict convex flux, *J. Hyper. Differential Equations*, **09**, (2012), 571–611.

[4] Adimurthi and G. D. Veerappa Gowda, Conservation laws with discontinuous flux, *J. Math. Kyoto Univ.* 43, 1, (2003), 27–70.

[5] Adimurthi, J. Jaffre and G.D. Veerappa Gowda, Godunov type methods for scalar conservation laws with flux function discontinuous in the space variable, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* 42, 1, (2004), 179–208.

[6] Adimurthi, S. Mishra and G. D. Veerappa Gowda, Optimal entropy solutions for conservation laws with discontinuous flux-functions, *J. Hyperbolic Differ. Equ.* 2, 4, (2005), 783–837.

[7] Adimurthi, S. Mishra and G. D. Veerappa Gowda, Explicit Hopf-Lax type formulas for Hamilton-Jacobi equations and conservation laws with discontinuous coefficients, *J. Differential Equations*, 241, (2007), 1, 1–31.

[8] B. Andreianov, C. Donadello, S.S. Ghoshal and U. Razafison, On the attainability set for triangular type system of conservation laws with initial data control, *J. Evol. Equ.*, **15**, (2015), 503–532.

[9] B. Andreianov, K. H. Karlsen and N. H. Risebro, A theory of L^1-dissipative solvers for scalar conservation laws with discontinuous flux. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 201, 1, (2011), 27–86.

[10] F. Ancona and A. Marson, On the attainability set for scalar non linear conservation laws with boundary control, *SIAM J.Control Optim*, 36, 1, (1998), 290–312.

[11] F. Ancona and G. M. Coclite, On the attainable set for Temple class systems with boundary controls. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 43, 6, (2005), 2166–2190.

[12] A. Bressan and G. M. Coclite. On the boundary control of systems of conservation laws. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 41, 2, (2002), 607–622.

[13] R. Bürger, K.H. Karlsen, N.H. Risebro and J. D. Towers, Well-posedness in BV_t and convergence of a difference scheme for continuous sedimentation in ideal clarifier thickener units, *Numer. Math.* 97, 1, (2004), 25–65.

[14] R. Bürger, K.H. Karlsen, N.H. Risebro and J. D. Towers, Monotone difference approximations for the simulation of clarifier-thickener units. *Comput. Visual. Sci.*, 6, (2004), 83–91.

[15] C.Castro, F.Palacios and E.Zuazua, Optimal control and vanishing viscosity for the Burgers equations, *Integral methods in science and engineering*, 2, Birkhouser Boston Inc, Boston MA, (2010), 65–90,

[16] C.Castro and E.Zuazua, Flux identification for 1-d scalar conservation laws in the presence of shocks, *Math.Comp.*, 80, (2011), 2025–2070.

[17] J.-M. Coron, Global asymptotic stabilization for controllable systems without drift, *Math. Control Signals Systems.*, 5, 3, (1992), 295–312.

[18] J.-M. Coron, S. Ervedoza, S. S. Ghoshal, O. Glass and V. Perrollaz, Dissipative boundary conditions for 2×2 hyperbolic systems of conservation laws for entropy solutions in BV- *submitted*.

[19] C. M. Dafermos, Hyperbolic Conservation Laws in Continuum Physics, 2 nd edition, Springer Verlag, Berlin, (2000).

[20] S. Diehl, Continuous sedimentation of multi-component particles, *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.*, 20, (1997), 1345–1364.

[21] T. Gimse and N. H. Risebro, Solution of the Cauchy problem for a conservation law with a discontinuous flux function, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 23 (1992), 635–648.

[22] O. Glass and S. Guerrero, On the uniform controllability of the Burgers equation, *SIAM J. Control optim.*, **46**, no.4 (2007), 1211–1238.

[23] T. Horsin, On the controllability of the Burger equation, *ESIAM, Control optimization and Calculus of variations*, 3, (1998), 83–95.

[24] K. T. Joseph and G. D. Veerappa Gowda, Explicit formula for the solution of Convex conservation laws with boundary condition, *Duke Math.J.*, 62, (1991) 401–416.

[25] J.D. Towers, Convergence of a difference scheme for conservation laws with a discontinuous flux, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* 38, 2, (2000), 681–698.